

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim amendment/Status

Claims 1-18 remain pending in the application. Claim 1 has been amended to improve form. No new matter is introduced by this syntactical amendment.

Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)

- 1) The rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Teichmer (US6380994 B1) in view of Takahashi (US 5912709 A) is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has admitted that Teichmer does not explicitly disclose that transmission of the second signal s2 may start with the I or P packet of complete data closest following the instant T_0 indicated by the splicing command $Cc(T_0)$. To overcome this admitted shortcoming the rejection turns to Takahashi to suggest this feature.

Takahashi provides a method wherein links two signals (a) and (b), each signal comprising compressed picture data frames. The first signal (a) is output out as it is until the editing point has been reached (column 5, lines 44-47, fig 4), and the second signal is decoded from this editing point.

Takahashi chooses the I or P frame just after (column 6, lines 10-11, fig 4) or just before (column 7, lines 37-39) the editing point to be the first frame of the resulting signal after the editing point, but in all the examples given in Takahashi fig 4 to 7, there is always an I or a P frame in the second signal (b) just next to the editing point (before or after). This I or P frame is chosen as the first frame of the second signal (b) to be decoded but Takahashi never suggests starting the decoding of the second signal (b) by choosing from this second signal the closest I or P frame to the editing point.

Also, if the method of the invention of amended Claim 1 was applied to the signals given in Fig. 6 of Takahashi, assuming that the editing point corresponds to the splicing

command $Cc(T_0)$, the second signal decoding would have started one frame before the editing point and the first signal transmission would have ended at least one frame before the editing point and not just after the editing point, as with Takahashi.

In light of the comments above, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of claim 1 is not obvious over Teichmer in view of Takahashi. All other claims are non-obvious under 35 USC 103 due to their dependency on Claim 1.

None of the other documents cited by the Examiner overcome the deficiencies of Teichmer and Takahashi. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that all claims are inventive over the prior art cited by the Examiner.

Therefore, the Applicant summarily traverses the rejections of:

- 2) claims 9-15 and 17 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Teichmer (US6380994 B1) in view of Takahashi (US 5912709 A) as applied to claims 1-8 above, and further in view of Fox et al. (US 6181383 B1);
- 3) claim 16 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Teichmer (US6380994 B1) in view of Takahashi (US 5912709 A) as applied to claims 1-8 above, and further in view of Kelly et al. (US 6952521 B2); and
- 4) claims 18-19 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Teichmer (US6380994 B1), Takahashi (US 5912709 A) and Fox et al. (US 6181383 BA) as applied to claims 9-15 and 17 above, and further in view of Kelly et al. (US 6952521 B2);

for at least the reasons advanced above and further in that none of the tertiary references contain any disclosure which rectifies the shortcoming which exists between Teichmer and Takahashi.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP



Kenneth M. Berner
Registration No. 37,093

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: October 24, 2008
KMB/KT/ser